MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

PERFORMANCE, COMPENSATION &

TALENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

OPEN SESSION

ROBERT F. CARLSON AUDITORIUM

LINCOLN PLAZA NORTH

400 P STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 2017 4:10 P.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 10063

## APPEARANCES

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Mr. Michael Bilbrey, Chairperson

Mr. Richard Costigan, Vice Chairperson

Mr. John Chiang, represented by Ms. Jeree Glasser-Hedrick

Mr. Richard Gillihan

Ms. Dana Hollinger

Mr. Ron Lind

Ms. Theresa Taylor

#### BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Henry Jones, Vice President

Mr. J.J. Jelincic

Mr. Bill Slaton

Ms. Betty Yee, represented by Ms. Lynn Paquin

# STAFF:

Ms. Marcie Frost, Chief Executive Officer

Mr. Ted Eliopoulos, Chief Investment Officer

Mr. Matthew Jacobs, General Counsel

Ms. Tina Campbell, Chief, Human Resources Division

Ms. Carol Takehara, Committee Secretary

	I N D E X	PAGE
1.	Call to Order and Roll Call	1
2.	Executive Report	2
3.	Consent Items Action Consent Items a. Approval of the February 14, 2017 Performance, Compensation & Talent Management Committee Meeting Minutes	3
4.	Consent Items Information Consent Items a. Annual Calendar Review b. Draft Agenda for the September 19, 2017 Performance, Compensation & Talent Management Committee Meeting	3
Action Agenda Items		
5.	2017-18 Incentive Plans of the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Investment Officer	3
6.	Biennial Salary Survey	6
Information Agenda Items		
7.	Summary of Committee Direction	45
8.	Public Comment	46
Adjournment		46
Reporter's Certificate		47

## 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: I think we threw them off 3 on the -- there we go. All right. Calling the 4 Performance, Compensation and Talent Management Committee 5 to order. 6 Roll call, please. 7 COMMITTEE SECRETARY TAKEHARA: Michael Bilbrey? 8 CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Here. 9 COMMITTEE SECRETARY TAKEHARA: Jeree 10 Glasser-Hedrick --ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GLASSER-HEDRICK: Here. 11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY TAKEHARA: -- for John 12 13 Chianq? 14 Richard Costigan? 15 VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Here. 16 COMMITTEE SECRETARY TAKEHARA: Richard Gillihan? 17 COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: Here. 18 COMMITTEE SECRETARY TAKEHARA: Dana Hollinger? 19 COMMITTEE MEMBER HOLLINGER: Here. 20 COMMITTEE SECRETARY TAKEHARA: Ron Lind? COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Here. 21 COMMITTEE SECRETARY TAKEHARA: Theresa Taylor? 22 23 COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Here. 2.4 COMMITTEE SECRETARY TAKEHARA: Thank you. 25 CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: All right. Next is

Executive Report, Ms. Campbell.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Good afternoon members of the Performance, Compensation and Talent Management Committee. Tina Campbell, CalPERS team member on behalf of Doug Hoffner. Before you today are two action items, approval of CEO and CIO's 2017-18 performance plans, and results of compensation research conducted for the biennial salary survey with options for the Committee's consideration.

The information items -- the information item provides an overview of the '16-'17 investment management plans and how they have been modeled after the Board's direction provided as part of the compensation program review last August.

At the Committee's next open session meeting in September, staff will present results of '16-'17 performance metrics, which were adopted by the Board for inclusion in the CEO and CIO's incentive plans. In addition, a closed session meeting will be held in September to conduct the annual performance reviews of the CEO and CIO, a summary of appraisal outcomes for all other covered positions will also be provided.

In advance of th meeting, you will receive an electronic survey to provide comments and feedback on the CEO's performance and survey results will be compiled for

discussion in the September closed session meeting.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, this concludes my report.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Thank you.

Next, we move to consent items, approval of the minutes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Move the minutes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Second.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Moved by Mr. Costigan, second by Ms. Taylor.

Any discussion on the minutes.

Seeing none.

All those in favor say aye?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Opposed?

Motion carries.

Consent items. I've had no one ask to take any items on the consent off the calendar, which moves us to Item 5, 2017-18 performance plan of the Chief Executive Officer and Chief Investment Officer.

Before we start that, Mr. Jelincic.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah. Rob has decreed that I can't participate in five and six, five because of the AG's opinion, and the fact that it deals with the CEO and the CIO. Six, because staff combined classes that I can participate in and classes I can't, so I won't be

participating in that.

2.4

But one of the points I do want to make is somebody decided that when I opened my Diligent Book, it's -- to 5 and 6, it says, "Document hidden. You are seeing this message because the documents contained in this section have limited distribution. Please navigate to the next available page".

Apparently, somebody didn't realize that that's a public document, and I can get it simply by going to the website. So it is clearly restricted only to me. And I have raised this issue in the past, have been told it would not happen again, but it has. And so this time I'm doing it publicly so that it won't happen again.

And I want to acknowledge that I'm glad I didn't have to file a public records request to get the documents, because if I had, I'd get beat up by some members of the Board.

So anyhow, I will be leaving and not participating. But that should not happen that a Board member cannot get a public document.

If it's on the website, it should show up on my iPad. So I thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Duly noted.

Ms. Frost.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah. Thank you,

Mr. Chair. Mr. Jelincic brought this up with me in our weekly check in last week. And so I'm working with the Board Services Unit on making sure that Diligent is set up that it can separate closed session items from open session items. And once we're able to work through that, there is no problem with giving you open session documents through Diligent.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: I will point out that in terms of the closed session item, if you look at my iPad, it doesn't even indicate that there was a closed session, so clearly, they can separate the two.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: We are working through that with the understanding that you would have access to open session items in Diligent and not have to go to the website.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: And, I mean, especially if it's out on the web, because gess what, I went and read it.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Campbell.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Thank you.

Tina Campbell, CalPERS team member. Agenda Item 5 is an action item. This item presents for approval the 2017-18 incentive plans for the Chief Executive Officer

and Chief Investment Officer.

2.4

As discussed earlier in closed session, the plans of the CEO and CIO continue to contain the performance metrics and total fund investment performance measures adopted by the Board last year. A measure focused on key leadership priorities is included in each plan. And the CIO's plan also contains a measure related to organizational priorities in the business plan and Investment Office Roadmap.

Board approval of the CEO and CIO plans is recommended. This concludes my report on the item. I'm Happy to answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: What's the pleasure of the Committee?

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Move approval.

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Moved by Lind, seconded by Costigan.

Any discussion on the motion?

Seeing none.

All those in favor say aye?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Opposed?

Motion carries.

Thank you. Next Item 6, Biennial Salary Survey.

Ms. Campbell.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Tina Campbell, CalPERS team member.

Agenda Item 6 is an action item as well. This item presents compensation data and possible base salary increases options for the Committee's consideration. As a result of the Committee's direction in February to conduct a biennial salary survey, existing data sets from two surveys and additional compensation data gathered internally were utilized to inform the options proposed in the this item.

The compensation data analyzed included the results of the separate 2015 McLagan compensation study and an externally-conducted in which CalPERS participated in December 2016 with 58 other public pension funds.

In addition, public sector salary data was gathered internally from reciprocal agencies for positions similar to those covered under the Board's compensation setting authority. The reciprocal agency data includes information from 27 city and county agencies, in addition to departments known to share talent pools with CalPERS SMUD, the State Controller -- I'm sorry, the SCIF, the State Compensation Insurance Fund, CalSTRS, and Covered California. A summary of findings from the three data sets is included in your packets in attachment 1.

In addition, based upon Committee direction to bring back compensation data relative to some of CalPERS career executive assignment positions, information was also collected from the reciprocal agencies on positions similar to the three -- to three of our CEA positions.

That information is included for the Committee's information in the last two pages of attachment one. Although, these positions are not covered under the Board's compensation setting authority, and will not be impact by any action taken today.

In 2015, when the last salary survey of private and public sector data, as described in the compensation policy, was conducted. McLagan's findings indicated that CalPERS salary ranges were positioned at the 25th percentile of the data at the minimum of the ranges, and at the 75th percentile at the maximum.

In addition, CalPERS total cash compensation resided at or below the 25th percentile of the data, which is historically consistent with the approximate positioning of total compensation for the program. At the time of the 2015 survey results were presented, there were no significant changes made aside from altering the maximum of a few ranges in which there were incumbents with salaries in the 4th quartile of the range.

Based upon the fact that the salary ranges are

largely the same as they were at the time of the 2015 survey, the current positioning of the salary ranges and total compensation in relation to the comparator group remains similar as well.

2.4

This has been confirmed by Grant Thornton's own market research data and is noted in the opinion letter included as attachment four.

Action taken on either of the options outlined today would be made effective July 1st, 2017. And I want to note that any increases to the existing salary ranges will not result in an automatic pay increase to staff.

Any future base pay increases will be earned as a result of the annual appraisal process. Before I go over the proposed options for the Committee's consideration, I'd like to direct you to -- your attention to attachment 2 which will be useful as a reference.

It displays where all the incumbents are positioned in the four quartiles of each salary range, and in particular quartile four is what we'll be focusing on today.

One correction to note, is the Chief Actuary's salary should be listed as in the first quartile not the third.

There are two proposed options before the Committee for consideration today. Option 1, for

classifications with one or more incumbents currently compensated at the maximum of the range would be to raise the maximum of the range by four percent. This option would allow room in the range for these incumbents to receive an earned base pay increase received through the annual appraisal process, and would impact potentially up to four incumbents.

Option 2, for classifications which have one or more incumbents in the fourth quartile, to raise the maximum of the range by five percent. This option would also provide room in salary range for incumbents to receive full base pay increase earned through the annual appraisal process, and would potentially impact up to 14 incumbents.

Grant Thornton, the Board's executive compensation consultant, has reviewed these proposed options for salary range revisions and the compensation data presented in this item. The review and compensation of this information to Grant Thornton's market data resulted in the opinion letter, which is included in attachment 4, as I mentioned previously.

Any changes made to salary ranges as a result of this item will be reflected in the compensation program policy. This concludes my report on this item. I'm happy to answer any questions. In addition, Mr. Eliopoulos and

Mr. Tollette are available to answer any questions or provide additional context.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Thank you.

So I just wanted to reiterate that, first, there's these two options, but there's also technically a third option, which the Committee chooses to do nothing.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL:

Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: So we could do these two or do nothing at all. Second, this is a framework to put in place, but this is not a salary increase relative to the actio we take today. That will not take place until September, when we go through the evaluation process of the performance plans and make our determinations at that time whether or not to even go -- move forward with anything.

So today is only putting a framework in place for those currently in place for those who are here, or in the future for those who would have the positions.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: With that, Mr. Costigan.

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Thank you, Mr.

Bilbrey. Just a couple observations.

Ms. Campbell, first of all, I appreciate you

doing this in really thank the HR Department for getting this information and looking at some of the other folks that we compare with. I would still like to have the University of California. I don't see them there.

So just a couple of things. First, I want to acknowledge both Ted, Wylie and their staff and recognize that unfortunately what the report shows again is that we don't pay enough, that we aren't setting aside the resources.

And this is an interesting position we find ourselves in. There is enormous pressure to bring more in-house, demand higher returns, really ask the staff to do more, but we haven't necessarily moved the salaries in the same direction.

And I think on one hand, what this report is good, is we're never going to compete with the Goldman Sachs and the Apollos of the world and we just have to recognize that. But my frustration -- and I know that Mr. Gillihan may address this, but I'll look to CalhR a little bit is, it is Covered California. You know, how are we competing when we lose our health care staff, how are we losing with CalSTRS when I understand that, as a sister agency, they're paying more?

I'm not going to pick on the CIO of UC, but I am still somewhat concerned - I could use a strong word, but

concerned - that the compensation for the CEO is almost 40 percent higher than our CIO and yet their fund is two-thirds smaller. And I will be taking up with the incoming chair of the Regents, who's actually a partner of mine, we've been talking about these disparities. Because even in looking at the UC website, one of the difficulties we run into is their salary structure is commiserate[sic] with experience.

Well, what does that exactly mean?

I mean, there is no salary bands. The other thing is UC employees are not subject to PEPRA. That was one of the issues where they're on the outside. So even from a retirement structure, those are -- so as we try to get to these apples to apples, it's a little -- and I know we're not going to be taking up pay today.

But again, I want to give credit to Mr. Bilbrey, and to Ms. Mathur last year, working towards this to again to address it, because we have got to find it. You can't demand that we ask the staff to do more and bring more in-house without finding an ability to pay more. And I don't know what the answer to that, because again at the end of the day, these are civil service positions.

But it is very disheartening to see us in the lowest quartile. I wouldn't expect to see us in the top quartile just as a State agency. We're never going to get

there, but to see that we have the majority of the folks in the Investment Manager and the Associate Manager -- well, a significant number, so one-fourth of the IMs in the lowest, and almost 45 percent in quadrants one or two is something, I know, Mr. Chair, that you're going to look forward to addressing.

So thank you.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Thank you.

Mr. Gillihan.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to ask Ms. Campbell a question. When -- for the positions that the Board sets the salary for, when the State extends a general salary increase to excluded employees, non-represented employees, does the system automatically apply that to this group of individuals as well?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: It does not. The Board would have to take that action.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: Does the system extend their salary range as a result of the State doing a general salary increase?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Not automatically.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: Okay. So there's no

```
linkage between what happens with these CalPERS positions and what we do in the broader State workforce?
```

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: That is correct.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Ms. Taylor.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: So on top of what Mr. Gillihan was asking, is there -- all of these have top ranges, right, of -- so they can continue -- I don't imagine anybody is -- well, I shouldn't say that. Is somebody at the top range?

12 HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Yes,
13 there is.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay.

15 CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: I believe it's attachment 16 2.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: I looked at that and I
18 was like I wasn't sure.

Okay. So then --

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: So the policy once you're at -- you can only get four percent once you're in the fourth quartile. And once you hit the top, you can't even get that four percent, even if you're outstanding --

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay. So you top

```
1
    out --
 2
             HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL:
3
    unless you change. Yes.
 4
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: -- basically like any
5
    other State employee who tops out in the range.
                                                      That
6
   might be a problem. So that might be something we should
7
    revisit.
8
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Seeing no one else to
9
    speak. This is an action item. What is the pleasure of
10
    the Committee?
11
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I'll move staff
   recommendation.
12
13
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Second.
14
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Which one?
15
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I'll move both items,
16
    I'm sorry.
17
             Oh, your -- 1, 2, or 3. I'm sorry.
18
             I'm looking at the wrong none.
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: So which one are -- which
19
20
    option are you looking for or moving? Which one are we
    moving, option 1, 2, or the 3rd one being nothing?
21
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: I think we've -- hold
22
23
    on.
```

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL:

2.4

25

I --

```
1
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Three was nothing,
 2
    right?
 3
             HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL:
 4
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Yeah, 3 would be nothing.
5
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: I think option one
6
   would be it.
7
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I think Option 1,
8
    sorry.
9
             HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Can I
10
    comment on -- just on option 2, I just want to make sure
11
    that I was clear. And I might not have been, but option
    2 -- although option 1 would definitely take care of
12
13
    anybody that's already at the top, option 2 there will be
14
    people that will reach the top before a year, so they
15
    would be limited and not be able to get their full four
16
    percent either, which is why we were suggesting option 2.
17
             I'm just providing context. And also Ted and
   Wylie are here and Marcie, if you guys want some
18
19
   additional context.
20
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Okay. So let me finish
21
    with the motion or -- well, Ms. Taylor has moved -- are
22
    you -- who's moving?
23
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: What?
2.4
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Moving. Who's move?
25
             You started. You threw it to her.
```

```
VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Well, I was going --
1
 2
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: I was going to ask if
3
   we could hear from --
 4
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Yeah, can we ask
5
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: So before the -- okay.
                                                           So
   before we finish a motion --
6
7
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I'll withdraw the
8
   motion for staff recommendation.
9
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Okay. There we go.
                                                        There
10
   we go.
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I would like to hear
11
   from staff.
12
13
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: All right. They would like
14
   to hear from Mr. Eliopoulos.
15
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Actually, could you
16
   turn on my microphone, please.
17
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Oh, sorry.
18
            VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. So first
19
   of all, Ms. Campbell, what is the HR Department's
20
   recommendation?
             HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Option
21
22
    2, at a minimum would be our recommendation.
23
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. Thank you.
24
             And yes, Mr. Chair, I would like to hear from
```

25

both the CEO and CIO.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Okay. Let's give Mr.
Eliopoulos --

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: And your recommendation first.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: -- first option, since he didn't have to say anything.

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, members of the Committee. Ted Eliopoulos, Chief Investment Officer.

Thank you for asking for commentary. I think in terms of the options in front of you, the option 2 would allow us to reward some of the 13 of our investment directors that will be in that fourth quartile range, so that would be our preference just to speak directly.

I think the other topic that was raised for future consideration is one that the Committee has wrestled with in years past which is targeting the overall compensation level for the Investment Office at the bottom quartile of this peer range.

And the peer range is, I think, very conservatively constructed in the sense that it only includes peer U.S. public pension funds and mid-range asset managers. So it doesn't include any -- it doesn't include the Goldman Sachs and Apollos of the world. It's constructed to be roughly comparable the size of Calpers

and the direct peers that we recruit from.

And to have the targeted compensation at bottom quartile is one I think the Committee should continue to keep its eye on, because to expect over long periods of time, you know, top quartile or medium quartile performance and target bottom quartile compensation will create, I think over time, issues from a recruitment and retention standpoint.

So I think you're wise to continue to have these conversations and to think through your goal for both the peer set and the targeted compensation level. And in that regard, I do think CalSTRS has actually come up with a fairly innovative approach. They have selected the 50th percentile. But in so doing, they've put a cap on any of their investment professionals, is how I understand it from Ms. Campbell, from moving beyond the 25th percentile, unless the CEO and the CIO approve it on a selective one-by-one basis.

And that might be something for the Committee to think in the future, because I think that's been a positive for their system.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Thank you.

Ms. Frost.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Thank you, Mr.

25 | Chair, members of the Committee.

I would concur with Ted's comments, I think, on the range itself supporting option 2, expanding that top of the salary range out five percent. It gives you the most flexibility and us more flexibility in determining how to place people who have outstanding performance. If we have individuals who have outstanding performance in the range would prohibit us from awarding appropriately, then that could be problematic for morale, recruitment, retention.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Thank you.

Mr. Gillihan.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So the difference between option 1 and 1 is one

15 | percent, right?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Correct.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: So --

18 HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: And

19 more people.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: And option 1 covers more

21 people.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

20

COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: Okay. So I know

23 these a very talented staff that do great work for us, but

24 | they also are some of our highest paid civil service

25 | employees in the State of California. And so when we

2.2

```
extend salary increases, we do it on a percentage basis. And, you know, a four percent increase to these folks, in terms of total dollars is an order of magnitude more than it is to the members miss taylor represents when -- if we were to extend a four percent pay raise to those folks.
```

So I ask this Committee to keep that in mind. These are State employees. We value the work they do. They do a fantastic job, and they're certainly worth the money that they make, but out of equity for the broader State workforce, who are also California civil service employees that do a great job for the State of California every day, I would respectfully ask the Board to consider option 1, and I would move option 1.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Could I just point out one more thing between option 1 and 2?

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Before you go on, there's a motion a the floor.

Is there a second?

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Second.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Second for option 1?

Okay.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: But I also have

23 comments.

24 CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Okay. Ms. -- go ahead Ms.

25 | Campbell.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Just a follow-up on Mr. Costigan's comment. Option 1 includes three classifications. Option 2 includes five. And out of those, some of the lower classifications are included in option 2. So again, just to make sure I'm providing all the information for you to make the decision.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: All right. Ms. Taylor.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: So let me ask a question, and I appreciate, Mr. Gillihan, what you said about this. And it does make sense, which is why I seconded this.

So my question to Ms. Campbell is how come the options put in front of us can't include the same number of people, and just be a percentage difference? Is there a way we could reconstruct that?

I'm reading them. It doesn't look like they're significantly different other than the percentage point. And the fact that some cover more employees -- the one covers more employees.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Yeah. So the difference really is that option 1, they're already at the max. Option 2 there's others that are going to approach the max before the year is up. And that -- but can you combine them? Absolutely. You could just -- but option 2 actually does combine them. I guess that's my

1 answer.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: So option 2 does combine them, but it also increases it an extra percentage point?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: That's correct, because based on the policy the folks that in the fourth quartile can only get up to four percent, but that doesn't -- that doesn't restrict the other folks that aren't there yet. And it just puts the range at an even number of five percent.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: So something -- so what you're saying is you're treating this as if it's a classification increase at five percent?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Yeah, I think you could look at it that way.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Like a State employee classification increase?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Yeah, for the salary range.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Are you done, Ms. Taylor?

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: You want to -- yeah,

24 I'm done. Go ahead.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Ms. Glasser-Hedrick.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER GLASSER-HEDRICK: I had the same question as Ms. Taylor regarding the difference between the two options. I mean, it seems to me make sense. In order to retain good employees, it's difficult or challenging to arrive at a situation where they're performing well, and you don't have the ability to provide extra incentives.

But I guess my question was the difference between the four and the five percent. And I think you -- I think you addressed that in your comments to Ms. Taylor. Is it potentially possible to include everybody that would be stepped out by the end of the year, but also move forward with the four percent, or is that not an option?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Yeah, that's actually -- the reason that the two are separated it's really what the appetite of the Board is. If we wanted to deal strictly with people that are at the max already, and if there is anything to do, now is the time to do it, because this would become effective July 1st 2017.

The team members that are in option 2 will get their eventually before the year is up, so we didn't want to leave them out. And then, as we've talked about in quite some length, not just this year, but at least the last year that I was here and the years prior, is until we

have an appetite to do something about the ranges, this is an opportunity to do something in the short-term, if the Board so chooses to.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Mr. Gillihan.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to note with respect to this notion that everything is a clean five percent, when we do general salary increases, we adjust the salary schedules -- the salary ranges, and so the math never works out. So you would get five percent in a typical MSA adjustment, until you got to whatever the gap between where you were and the top of the range was. And if that was four and a half, it's four and a half, if it's five, it's five, but it's likely something less than 5.

Mr. Chair, I'd like to withdraw my motion, and make an alternative motion that we take the recommendation number 2, so this applies to all the ranges in the investment -- the classifications under discussion, but at a four percent increase, not a five percent.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Is that amenable to the Ms. Taylor?

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: That's amenable to the second, yes.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: All right. So the original motion is withdrawn. The new motion is option 2 with four

```
1
   percent, instead of five.
 2
             And Mr. Costigan.
 3
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All right. So Mr.
 4
    Gillihan has thrown me for a loop. I think I'm inclined
5
    to vote against this motion on the four percent and rather
    make it five. And here's why, as the Chair of Finance and
6
7
    Administration Committee, last month we talked about $199
8
    million in savings that the Investment Office did for us,
9
    and continue to have savings. I think that more than
10
    encompasses a five percent increase in pay.
11
             And, I mean, in the -- unless there's a
    disagreement, I mean, I'm looking to the two of you all
12
13
    who have to bring these folks in. I mean, you're going to
    continue to receive direction from both the Committee and
14
15
    the Board to continue to reduce external manager cost.
16
    what is the difference between four and five percent?
17
    we have a budget number?
18
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: One percent.
19
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I know it's one
20
   percent. I'm sorry.
21
             (Laughter.)
22
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Thank you.
                                                      Thank
23
    you, Ms. Taylor. I can do my math today.
2.4
             (Laughter.)
25
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: One percent.
                                                        Ιs
```

1 | it -- so is it --

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: And I could just add one comment. So expanding the range by five percent does not mean that every person in that range --

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: No, I understand.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: -- is going to get the five percent.

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I get that.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: It's giving us the flexibility --

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: It's an MSA.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: -- to reward to the full extent of the incentive plans --

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Correct.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: -- that have already been approved, but it doesn't mean that everyone is going to get a five percent. We would use the incentive comp metrics --

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: And that's why we trust you all to make that decision.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: -- to determine where they fit in that range.

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: And that's why to give you the authority. So if we were to give everybody, what's the dollar amount we're looking at?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Yeah, about 109,500.

2.4

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Okay. So the difference between four and five percent is \$110,000, which is, let me see if I can do my math, 0.001 of the savings of 199 million or is it 0.00001?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: So I don't have the answer to the way that you're asking the question. But what would be different here is just the four incumbents at the -- that would get the four percent, they would be --

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Right. And Ms.

Campbell, I -- I'm just being a little bit facetious -
HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Okay.

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: -- because what I'm pointing out is we saved nearly \$200 million and we're talking about \$110,000.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I would be more than happy to support the increase. I normally love being with Calhr, but I will be voting against this motion. I will make a substitute motion after you've called the others, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Mr. Slaton.

BOARD MEMBER SLATON: Yeah, I just want to echo what Mr. Costigan says. And, you know, the out-of-pocket cost to Calpers today is not going to be -- you know, I mean it is a hundred -- potentially up \$100,000 or so.

But it's really about the signals and message we're sending in the ability to recruit. And I think that our objective -- and I forgot what the number is on outside fees that we pay for managers. But what's that number? Can you remind me, Ted, what that number is ballpark?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Eight hundred million.

BOARD MEMBER SLATON: \$800 million. So I would ask the Committee to consider doing the option 2 with the five percent, whatever procedurally you need to do to do that, because we're talking about big numbers. And this is really about recruitment and retention, not the fact of whether these people are going to leave or not leave, if it's four our five percent.

But you're definitely sending a message. We know we're trying to accomplish something really big here in terms of the overall program. So I just encourage you to adjust to get to five.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Ms. Taylor.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: So I was unaware that

```
this was not like a top of the range automatic four or five percent. So I'm not sure that I agree with it now, Richard, but I already seconded it. So I just wanted to make that clear.
```

The other part of this I think that, Mr. Chair, we might want to look at is how we do address the top-of-the-range issue that we have run into here in the future, so...

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Mr. Jones.

VICE PRESIDENT JONES: Just to let you know that when this item comes to the full Board, I will be supporting option 2.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Okay. Mr. Costigan.

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So I'm going to make a substitute motion of option 2 with up to the five percent for all of the classifications inside the Investment Office.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Is there a second?

COMMITTEE MEMBER LIND: Second.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Mr. Lind seconded.

So a substitute motion on the floor is option 2,

22 right?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Yeah, we're back to option

25 2.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

2.4

```
1
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Oh, wait a second.
 2
             CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: I just wanted to
3
    clarify your motion. Did you say all the investment
 4
    classes or all classifications in the --
5
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: All the investment
6
    classes.
7
             CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Yeah. So we do
8
   have non-investment --
9
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Oh, I'm sorry.
10
             HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: As
11
   proposed.
12
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: It's option 2 as
13
   proposed up to five percent.
14
             CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: Thank you.
15
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Okay. So just covering
16
   what is in option 2.
17
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Yes, option 2 up to
18
    the five percent. Back to the original option.
19
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Any further discussion?
20
             Seeing none.
21
             All those in favor say?
22
             (Ayes.)
23
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Opposed?
2.4
             (Noes.)
25
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Sounds like a 3-2
```

```
1
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Can we do a roll -- or a
 2
    electronic vote?
3
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: I'm a little confused.
 4
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Ms. Taylor has -- oh, you
5
   went away, Ms. Taylor.
6
             Sorry, I can't pull you back. Oh, we're voting.
7
             MS. HOPPER:
                          I can cancel the vote, if you want.
8
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: We are voting.
9
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: I need to ask a
10
    question, because I'm not clear. Can you wait? Oh,
11
    everybody is voting?
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Yeah, it already went into
12
13
    the voting session.
14
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: I don't want to vote
15
   until I ask the question.
16
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Go ahead an ask your
17
   question.
18
             COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: So all I want to know
19
    is --
20
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: You've got to turn
21
   her microphone one.
22
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: I can't get it up.
23
             VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Mr. Chair or Mr --
24
    can we just cancel the vote?
25
             CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Or can we --
```

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: She turned on the microphones.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: She turned it on. We turned it on.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: So at first, I thought we were -- so option 1 is the classifications that have one or more incumbents at the maximum salary range raise the maximum of the corresponding salary ranges by four percent. Option 2 is for classifications which have one or more incumbents in the fourth quartile of the salary range.

Now, I thought Richard Costigan was stating that he wanted both those combined at the five percent. Is that incorrect? So basically put, the incumbents that are at the max plus the ones that are entering the max at five percent, is that what I understand to be correct?

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: That would be -HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Yeah,
so it's back to the range itself will go to five percent,
but the policy states maximum that you can get when you're
in the fourth quartile is four percent.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: The policy states?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: The policy states, as it is written today.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: So we're changing the

policy.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: What you'd be changing is the range in the policy. But the policy would remain the same, because you can still only get up to four percent in the fourth quartile in the appraisal process. The salary range is the salary range. But when you go through the appraisal process, you would have to get an outstanding in order to get to four percent. Does that make sense?

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay. So they can't get five percent anyway, is that what you're saying?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Yeah. Again in attachment 2 for those in the fourth quartile, they could not get the five percent. It just bumps the range to five percent.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Ms. Frost.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: So that is true on the policy. But correct me if I'm wrong, Tina, the General Counsel and the Chief Operating Investment Officer could be eligible to up to five percent?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: No, four.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: No. Okay.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Four
percent.

1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: All right.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: It just bumps the range up a little bit more. And so --

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: It's the top of the range, right?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: So let's -- so let's go as if we're going into the next following year, and the Board chooses to do nothing, there would be another one percent room, I guess, if you want to look at it that way, if we do no other action after this. Because what we've been doing the last couple years is just giving what the maximum, which is four percent, allows when you're in the fourth quartile.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay. So I think we have the wrong motion on the floor then, if I'm correct about this. So what you're saying is that the fourth quartile folks can only go up four percent. The -- where am I? The classifications that are at the max can go up five percent.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: It's the reverse of that, if I'm understanding your question correctly.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Oh, no, you're right. You're right. So like the CIO, the --

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: So

somebody that wasn't quite at the max yet, there would be room to go all the way up to the five percent once you're -- this is going to be a little bit confusing, but I'm going to try to draw it out. Once you're in the fourth quartile and you meet outstanding, four percent is the highest you can get. If we increase the salary range to the five percent -- and maybe I would like at it as the MSAs --

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: I see.

that -- the way that we look at it in other State positions, is the five percent, although in an MSA is automatic, we could give you less, depending on your performance as the State of California, or we could give you nothing. But in the way the policy is written, the folks that sit in the fourth quartile --

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: So everyone one can only get four percent?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: That are in the fourth quartile

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: At and max, right?

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: And outstanding, correct.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay. So 25 everyone --

3.8

- COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: If you're at max and you're in the fourth quartile, right, I mean by definition.
- HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Yeah.

  It could have been probably written a little bit better,

  but what we're trying to do --
- 7 COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Well, yeah, because one 8 covers more employees, right?
- 9 HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: But one 10 is broader. Option 2 is definitely broader.
- COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: So and what was the point of putting five --
- HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Two.

  14 Did I say 1? Two is broader.

18

19

20

21

- COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Two is broader, so what

  was the point of putting the five percent in if it can -
  if you can only get four percent?
  - HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Because it's the salary range. And like I said, if we go next year and we do nothing, there's another one percent for people that are in the fourth quartile.
- COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: Okay. So I think we're back to the option 2.
- CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Well, there's a motion on the floor, so you need to vote on that one at this point.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: 1 Okay. CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: If you don't want --2 3 VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I'll withdraw my 4 motion. 5 CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Okay. Now, we'll withdraw 6 the motion. 7 So can we have a new motion then? 8 Oh, I need to have my -- this whole thing went 9 off, so I can't call on anybody. I have no idea what... 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: So Mr. Bilbrey --11 CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Hang on. VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: -- we've gone back 12 13 and forth on this. I would like either Ms. Campbell or 14 Ms. Frost to state what they believe the discussion -- the 15 dialogue has occurred. So Ms. Campbell do you want to try 16 just so we can make sure the record is clear. 17 HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: 18 So option 2 --19 VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Option 2. 20 HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: 21 would allow for the salary range max to be raised by five 22 percent. Option 2 would also allow for anyone that's at 23 the max in the fourth quartile to get up to four percent,

today. And option 2 would allow 14, potentially 14 -- up

which is the maximum you can get as the policy reads

24

25

```
to 14, if we do adopt the new salary range to take advantage of an increase. If we do stick with option 1, we would only be able to provide that opportunity for four.
```

2.1

2.4

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: And I just want to make sure, option 2 as written says 13 -- you're saying it would actually apply to 14.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL:

Fourteen. That's a typo. It is 14. Thank you for clarifying.

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I just want to make sure. Any -- Mr. Bilbrey, I just want to make sure. Ms. Frost was there anything else?

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER FROST: I think there's a third option. I think you could adopt option 2 at four percent also, and really get to the --

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: I guess I agree with Calhr right now.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER COSTIGAN: -- discussion and dialogue that's happening amongst the Committee members.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: It took a minute for you to get there, back now you're back with CalHR.

So is there a motion on the floor?

COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: So my motion still is

out there right, because we didn't vote on it?

VICE CHAIRPERSON COSTIGAN: Yeah, we're back to the orig -- we're back to Mr. Gillihan's --

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Okay. So we're back to Mr. Gillihan's motion which could you repeat whether it's option --

COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: Yeah. My motion was option 2, but modified to four percent instead of five percent.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Got it.

And Mr. Jones.

VICE PRESIDENT JONES: Yeah. Thank you. I'd just like to remind the Committee members of what we just witnessed a couple days ago. Our Chief Investment Officer talked about the wrath that the Investment staff takes, whether it's through media or individuals. And recognizing the demoralization that that has on staff, and here we are picking about one percent.

It's -- to me, it's not going in the right direction if we're talking about trying to improve the morale of our staff. It's just the wrong debate from my perspective.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Ms. Taylor.

COMMITTEE MEMBER TAYLOR: So I just want to -- I just clarified this myself, Henry, because I got very

confused. So what I understand is policy, and we're not changing policy here, policy states only a four percent raise is allowed at the highest range. So say they get an outstanding, they only get four percent. That five percent was to cover if next year we didn't do anything, so they'd get another percentage point next year.

So, well, I assume we're going to do something next year.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Mr. Eliopoulos, did you want to weigh-in at all?

CHIEF INVESTMENT OFFICER ELIOPOULOS: Definitely not wanting to pre-experience any pain for next year for sure, but I do think with all the sentiments being expressed, appreciate it. The fact that at four percent all -- is the maximum that we can give this year, if it brings a unanimity or, you know, more consensus amongst the Committee and the Board, I think it's a -- it's a good compromise from some of the discussion that I've heard today. It will not harm anyone, and then it does mean though that you'll have one percent less flexibility for next year.

But I think this -- I think we'll be back here next year with this discussion, and we can experience that flexibility there. But if it brings more, I think unanimity, or consensus, or reflects, you know, of the

opinions than making -- making this available to more of the Investment Managers and Directors in the Investment Office would be my priority over the last one percent, which we can discuss next time.

2.4

And I do want to apologize in terms of the way it's presented. It wasn't very -- it wasn't crystal clear on what these meant. But the Committee has done a good job of sussing it out and unwinding it on the fly, in this hearing.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Mr. Slaton.

BOARD MEMBER SLATON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So next year means July 1st, 2018, is that correct? Starting at that point. Okay. So we have over a year to address this problem. And I encourage the Committee and the Committee Chair to put this on the agenda early, have a broader discussion, where we're not under a calendar crunch, and we get a chance to revisit all aspects of this -- of compensation. And in light of what we're, from an overall standpoint, trying to accomplish. So we can have a broader conversation take our time, and do some good deliberations. So I think this solves the problem today, and then let's -- let's get to it early, Committee.

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Thank you Mr. Costigan -- or Mr. Slaton. You took the words out of my mouth.

Although I was trying to get the motion passed first, and then give that direction, but it will be the direction for us to explore that in the coming months.

With that, the motion is on the floor.

All those in favor say aye?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Opposed?

Motion carries.

We got there. I do want to -- thank you, Mr. Costigan.

and all the discussion to say that this Board values our staff in all that they do throughout the whole enterprise. And they can -- I assume know that the staff understands what constraints we're under as a Board and what we have to go through in determining. While we would love to compensate at -- especially in some of the cases we're talking about right now -- at a higher level. We are a public institution, a public entity, and it makes it very difficult for us, so -- but I do want the staff to know, and I think I speak on behalf of the Board, when I say thank you for all you do, because the work is tremendous and we wouldn't be here without you.

With that, I also want to take a moment of personal privilege. And while I don't want to say this,

because I want her to stay. At this time, I'd like to recognize thank Heather Mercer for her contributions over the last 13 years to the Performance, Compensation & Talent Management Committee.

Heather has been instrumental to the success of the compensation programs. And it's been a pleasure to work with her. Heather, congratulations on your promotion to the Legal Office. We wish you the best as you continue your journey in CalPERS.

Thank you.

Summary --

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Summary of direction.

HUMAN RESOURCES DIVISION CHIEF CAMPBELL: Yeah.

So I have a few items. That Mr. Costigan asked if we

could add the University of California as a competitor.

We missed that last time. And then also how to address top-of-the-range issue. And also to put on the agenda

early the discussion on all aspects of compensation, so we

20 done find ourselves where we are today.

Was there other direction that I missed?

CHAIRPERSON BILBREY: Very well. I think that

23 covers it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

2.4

25

Very well.

Next item, public comment. I have no requests.

```
1
    Is there anyone from the public who wishes to speak at
 2
    this time?
 3
              Seeing none.
 4
             This meeting is adjourned.
 5
              (Thereupon the California Public Employees'
 6
              Retirement System, Board of Administration,
 7
              Performance, Compensation, & Talent Management
             Committee meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m.)
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand 3 Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify: That I am a disinterested person herein; that the 4 foregoing California Public Employees' Retirement System, 5 Board of Administration, Performance, Compensation & 6 7 Talent Management Committee meeting was reported in 8 shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand 9 Reporter of the State of California; 10 That the said proceedings was taken before me, in 11 shorthand writing, and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by computer-assisted transcription. 12 I further certify that I am not of counsel or 13 14 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any 15 way interested in the outcome of said meeting. 16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand 17 this 27th day of June, 2017. 18 19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

James & Cathe

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 10063